DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 275 640 SP 028 193

AUTHOR Monahan, William G.
TITLE The Potential Bifurcation of American Teacher Education: A Point of View.
PUB DATE 2 Nov 86
NOTE 14p.; Paper presented at the Fall Meeting of the West Virginia Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (Charleston, WV, November 2, 1986).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Change; *Educational Development; Educational History; *Futures (of Society); Higher Education; Program Effectiveness; Program Length; *Teacher Education; Teacher Educators; Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

The current circumstances in the teacher education profession provide the appropriate environment for much needed, effective change in the field. Serious and thoughtful exploration should be made of the length of teacher education programs, with 4- and 5-year programs evaluated and/or developed to provide substantive professional content for prospective teachers. Program evaluation methods should also be carefully considered to ensure that quick, inappropriate decisions are not made about a specific type of teacher preparation program. Teacher educators must remain active in the profession and are the key leadership in effecting substantive change. (CB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED275640

THE POTENTIAL BIFURCATION OF AMERICAN TEACHER EDUCATION: A POINT OF VIEW

William G. Monahan

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W. G. Monahan

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP 028 193

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Potential Bifurcation of American Teacher Education: A Point of View

William G. Monahan

Professor, Administration and Higher Education
West Virginia University

Address at Fall meeting, WVACTE, November 2, 1986, Charleston, W.Va.

In thinking about a title for these comments, I considered adding the phrase, "Diagnosis and Treatment." To some extent that seemed in keeping with the medical metaphor that our melancholy profession seems unable to resist. But just a little reflection convinced me that although my comments are indeed somewhat diagnostic, it is, in fact, one "treatment" already prescibed that I want to discuss. So I have yielded to the ubiquitous 'medical model' by offering these comments as "a second opinion." And never one to let my ignorance stand in the way of treading where the proverbial angels fear, I will be brash enough to suggest some possible directions that could ameliorate our dilemma toward the end of this piece.

First of all, what do I mean by the "bifurcation" of academic teacher education? I mean simply, that the two sets of notable proposals that currently call for major changes in teacher education, and which strongly advocate that collegiate preparation of teachers be elevated to the graduate level creates the potential for a major rift in institutional patterns. My reference of course is to the Carnegie, and Holmes Group Reports. (1)

The obvious and immediate implication is that this focus on the structure of American academic Teacher Education will partition us into first and second classes (we don't really know which might be which), and it may in virtue of that also split us into two warring camps. But there are some other aspects of the still emerging "Teacher Education Reform" movement clearly related to the "structural" issue that deserve more thoughtful exploration if indeed we do not find ourselves dangerously at odds. And, incidentally, some of these aspects are considered in the two important reports.

And dispite the fact that the obvious structural issue -- whether training shall be undergraduate or graduate -- tends to obscure more substantive issues underlying that, I am also not so sure that thoughtful consideration of those underlying issues will make much difference. Never the less, they must be more carefully examined if all institutions now involved in the preparation of teachers can be in the best position to consider their own options. In that regard, I do believe that options must be considered for it seems to me that structure will determine substance rather than the other way around. Consequently, my consideration of substantive concerns may be analogous to kicking a dead cat but I think I'll kick it anyway.

There are several facets of the substantive issue of course, but an important one is the quite widely held conviction that present demands and imperitives simply require more time than is currently available in the traditonal four-year curriculum. I emphasize the notion of "conviction" because while I think the logic is persuasive, I also don't think that there is much objective evidence as yet to support the fact of too little time. And less still that conventional restructuring will automatically provide the additional time we need. Moreover, I don't think there CAN BE any evidence of that sort until there is some kind of ex post factum

SP 028 193

comparison drawn between the relative effectivenesses of performances between persons who have completed the newer program models compared to those who have completed traditional programs.

Now right at that point, I need to pay my respects to some programs, now of some reasonable duration that have inaugurated longer-than-four-years preparation patterns and whose proponents are convinced based on their own experience and data, are IN FACT better; better that is, than what they had been doing previously. That's an important qualification. I refer to some of the "extended programs" that we know about as a result of the work several of us were involved with over a period of years with the Extended Program Task Force of AACTE. These include fairly well established programs at Austin College in Texas and at the University of New Hampshire; and there is accumlating experience with the more recent and more ambitious programs at the University of Kansas, and in the University of Florida's "ProTeach" which is of still more recent vintage. Both of these latter have five-year types of programs but with some essential differences.(2) And there is also some experience with the other pattern -- the "fifth year" model; Memphis State, as one example, has at least two versions of that model underway at the same time and their experiences thus far have been encouraging.(3)

Never the less, I still believe that it is an accurate assessment to say that the bulk of commitment and advocacy is based more on conviction than on evidence. That's simply because the final measure of differential effectiveness can only be determined by relatively conclusive data comparing performance in practice and you are clearly aware of the quite difficult -- almost impossible-- research control conditions that such a study would entail in order to conform to valididty and reliability criteria. Another measure, of course is "market feedback" -- that is, simply seeing how the newer patterns are reflected by assessments of graduates by employers.

Well, sure. But such long-term intelligence in either case will take years and it would be rediculous to wait until THAT jury comes in!

Now, I don't think there is anything wrong with conviction -- even passionate conviction as some of it now is, so long as it is informed conviction. I also believe that some aspects of the current advocacy for graduate level training do not address some of the fundamental problems that lie at the heart of the need for changes in the ways teachers are prepared. A fifth-year, add-on, M.A. pattern certainly MAY solve some of our problems but there is no particular magic in a proposition for post baccaulareate work in and of itself that cannot be persuasively refuted by others to the contrary. As a matter of fact, there are a number of astute authorities in our field who are more convinced that five year programs are much preferable to "fifth" year programs -- a position that many of you know I share.(4)

Substantive Issues, Half Truths, and Unexamined Presumtions

There are a number of substantive issues, half truths, and unexamined presumptions that I think need to be highlighted in the contemporary mood about teacher education reform. Among the substantive issues in arguments for revising the pattern of teacher preparation -- or at least the more important of them as I see it -- I want to mention only three; the first is related to a generally accepted premise, the second, to an implied one that has been far less considered, and the third, to an unresolvable suspicion. The first of these holds that contemporary teachers need to know a lot more about a lot more and therefore, those

of us who prepare them need more time in which to do it. The second -- the implied premise is that it doesn't make all that much difference if those who would teach don't really get "at" it until they're a lot older than they are under present circumstances. The third is the anxious and familiar economic issue: how can we talk about more extensive training when the salaries are already too low for the current, traditional time-investment. I want to briefly look at these substantive issues, as well as a couple of important "half-truths" and curious presumptions that exacerbate our deliberations.

The Issue of "More time"-- The argument for more time -- the "life space" phenomenon as it has been characterized -- is the compelling one.(5) There is no question that the society expects more of schools and of school personnel. Yet there hasn't been any genuine change in the structure of teacher education in the academy for nigh on to fifty years. The need for more time to work with those preparing to teach is almost self-evident when one begins to look even superficailly at the enormously expanded "knowledge base" today that should be reasonbly expected of teachers in training -- as indeed has been done with thoroughness and responsibility under AACTE auspices. (I refer here to the important AACTE Task Force work on the Knowledge Base.)(6)

It is pretty obvious that many institutions cannot do it in the patterns currently operable.

Now that is the case, I think, NOT because four years is not long enough -- it may or may not be; I happen to think that it isn't. But more importantly, even in a traditional four-year program there are no conventional SCDE's that I know of that have their students full time in any term other than during student teaching. And in the majority of teacher training programs in this country -- some large, some small -- they don't even have them full-time in the student teaching term for more than eight weeks! In the great majority of teacher training programs especially in the large, comprehensive places -- the Holmes Group kinds of institutions if you will, but in many smaller programs too -- many students are still trying to get into a "core" course that for sometimes even good reasons they could not get into until their senior year, and even though the accepted standard within institutions is that such students will spend the bulk of their upper level undergraduate terms "IN" SCDE's, we all know that is just not enough the case.

Incidentally, in this regard, you give me the Education "majors" (I deliberately put that in quotes) full time for their junior and senior years and I'll guarantee you that they'll be better prepared for the pedagogical encounter; now it's obviously true that if that is indeed the case, they will not have as much time for work in general studies nor in major and minor areas of concentration; that is, not enough time to get much depth in any of the disciplines that they are supposed to be somewhat expert in. As we all know, much of the criticism of what we do in preparing teachers has centered on lack of depth in so-called content fields.

Never the less, what "not enough time" also means is that our present patterns have grown too chaotic and organizationally incoherent. Thus, if you could insure in any program, the provision that teachers-in-training will all come in together, as a class and will go through their programs as a class, behave as a class, succeed and be challenged as a class, and yes, for some, confront the real terror of failure as a member of a class, then you would have a quite different pattern of atttitude and performance. A big part of our present problem is twofold: first, to borrow a phrase from the "school effectiveness" movement, there is not enough time-on-task, and secondly, there is an absence of the sociological conditions

which generate the kind of "we feeling" vital to identification with professional norms. On the contrary, we have a loosely-linked aggregation, not a community of neophytes moving through the rites-of-passage that mould them into a cohesive group. This is a condition so frequently overlooked when we utilize medical profession metaphors for comparison. And it is, to some extent, deeply embedded in the convictions that teacher training must be elevated to the graduate level.

We are not the first profession to confront the vicissitudes of not being able to have our students "full time." In fact, we may be the last to recognize it. That's why Law Schools adopted the J.D in place of the bachelors degree, and even Business Schools, by a less diliberate and more market-based pattern have gone bananas over MBS programs. The indoctrination of professional norms and so-called "clinical" didactics requires significant control over the "life space" of the student. In the large measure, we don't have that. This is, incidentally, where small, usually private liberal arts institutions, have a distinct advantage and simply further demonstrates that this issue has not been sufficiently explored.

Suffice to say that the issue of "more time" is exceedingly more complicated than a superficial analysis might at first imply. In our own fields, we have seen more sophisticated attention given--empirical and otherwise -- to the importance of so-called "clinical" activities and yet, we have been provided neither the time nor the resources to do that part of our training half as well as we know how to do.(7)

There are a lot of problems with SCDE's being able to do that sort of thing effectively and they have only a little to do with elevating teacher training to the graduate level. In the first place, that notion continues and further compounds the long-term tensions of our mixed marraige with "general education" -- read that, "liberal arts."

Put another way, even WE have not yet decided with any confidence whether we are a professional program or an applied social science! The idea, all glorious, to add a fifth year might perpetuate and further dilute our aspirations for professional status independent of undergraduate general education since it automatically invokes the provision of the masters degree, and that degree remains for all its imperfections, fundamentally an academic rather than a professional one.

It was precisely this set of realities that led me, some years ago while still a dean, to strongly advocate the six year -- 3 + 3 -- program leading to the "Teaching Doctorate." That was conceived as a professional program leading to a professional -- not an <u>academic</u>, degree.(8) Unfortunately, my champion in that initiative, President Gene Budig, made two important strategic errors: he appointed a vice president who deep-down, profoundly believed that anybody could teach who really wanted to do so with or without any pedagogical preparation and, perhaps more importantly, Budig accepted the clarion "call" to become Chancellor at another university. But then that's is a different tale to tell.

In that circumstance as well as in all of the current mood that I have been discussing, there is an important unexamined assumption that is much overlooked. It is partly a demographic phenomenon and, related to that, a problem of control and power. For example, consider that if there are not enough dentists to go around, a lot of people have decaying teeth; but in teaching, whereby we are subject to regulation as a quasi-governmental utility through the established mandates of a politically socialized function, if there are not enough teachers to go around, we just go out and get someone to fill-in. (No pun intended.) And since those of us who manage the basic training arm of our field have little control over licensure,

we are relatively powerless to hold the market place hostage for initial, certified competence. Add to that the reality of a continuing need for a work force of two and a half million persons and the concomitant evolution of a great diversity and quantity of programs to supply those manpower needs-- more than 1,300 of them by latest count -- and you see the futility of achieving the kind of cohesive solidarity necessary to enforce true quality control.

To some extent, this is partial explanation for Etzioni's characterization of teaching as a "semi-profession."(9) But another reason and an important source of many of our difficulties in achieving any consensus about the best ways to prepare persons to teach has to do with some full-blown half-truths with which everyone in this room is woefully aware.

There is, first of all, the stubbornly persisting conventional conviction -- even on the part of folks who ought surely to know better like that vice-president I mentioned-- that teaching is really something almost anybody can do if they know a little more than the children. In the academy that animates and perpetuates the notion that teacher training is, at best, just another of those "higher skilling" kinds of fields that colleges and universities at some weaker moment in the history of their needs to survive allowed to get in through the back door(10); or, at worst, from my point of view, a small area tolerated within a university or college that ought to do a little first-rate scholarly research ABOUT schools and education, provide those who might want to be teachers with a good undergraduate liberal arts major and then let the schools themselves train them in pedagogy.

Does that seem cynical? You know better. You know that there is a large and influential opinion in this country which holds that SCDE's add little to the competence of potential teachers. And ironically, some of those are in schools of education and who, until it became obviously of some public notoriety cared little at all about teacher education.

In that regard, it is instructive for us to remember that the history of teacher education has clearly reflected its lack of academic esteem. The first Normal school wasn't established until 1823 at Concord, Vermont as a private institution and the first public one not until 1839 at Lexington, Massachusetts -- by that time Harvard had already celebrated its 200th anniversary! And as late as 1931, when the Bachelor's degree was fairly well established, Educationists were rejoicing that 75% of elementary teachers had at least two years of collegiate preparation! Hot dog!

Moreoever, as we all know, even those who presided over the Teachers Colleges as they proliferated seized any opportunity to submerge their special status into more mainstream general liberal arts colleges. There is no longer a single, free standing undergraduate Teachers College left in America and, curiously, those who direct institutions that evolved from those humble beginnings would just as soon forget those origins. There are many in this room who toil now in such places. One is reminded of Voltaire's reference to his quarrel with Frederick the Great in his letter to Madame Denis; he said, "they have squeezed the orange and thrown away the fruit."

I think it is fair to say that there are no institutions today anywhere in America led by presidents or chancellors who will say that Teacher Education is among their highest priorities. But they will say, and have, that the public schools have done a disservice in providing to them, graduates who are not well prepared for college work. I will return to this leadership problem at the end of these comments for I believe there is an aspect of that which is useful to consider.

The Issue of When to Begin

The implied issue in the current reform idiology has to do with a presumption that one need not necessarily have to have any hands-on experiences with children and youth -- the clients of the teaching act -- until after the end of a program leading to the MA. Again, on this issue there is little real evidence one way or the other -- only, again, conviction. In this case, however, I think it is fair to say that conviction is not especially informed but is, rather, sort of stylish. Thus it is not a new concern any more than the idea of intesifying and extending the preparation time itself is a new concern.

I well remember, as a passing comment on this, that when I came as dean at WVU in 1972, we were all in something of a swivet as to how to get our future teachers into the field with "hands-on" experiences earlier in their programs. We worked long and hard to develop new course patterns and requirements, scuttled about to find places to "intern" Freshmen in our introductory sequence and generally created all manner of nuisances in doing all of that. The notion, eminently common sensical at the time was to the effect that one shouldn't delay opportunity for young people to find out whether pedagogy was truly what they might want to do with their lives until after they had already invested too many years in its preparation. Now, the implication of reform is that later is better than sooner. Interesting.

Among the more eloquent arguments on this issue were comments made in the Hunt Lecture for AACTE in 1967 -- now almost twenty years ago -- by Fr. Charles Donovan, first dean of Boston College's school of education and, at the time, its senior vice president. His comments are remarkably contemporary. He said: (11)

> ...people who said twenty years ago that all a teacher needed was a liberal arts education are now saying that the only respectable path to a teaching career is a four-year liberal arts program plus a fifth year of professional education and experience. We need not quarrel about the number of years. Soon we may be defending the proposition that a person is not ready to teach until seven years after secondary school. I distinguish between the time it takes to prepare a teacher, which is not my present question, and the appropriate time for beginning teacher preparation. I reject what is for some the dogma that the first four years of higher education must be 'undiluted' liberal arts, that not until the future teacher is twenty-two years old should he study a child or consider the process of schooling or think of his profession.

Sounds somewhat "deja vu", doesn't it?

On the other hand, I remember in retrospect, my own tentative, anxious, and altogether naive beginnings as a public school teacher. I was twenty-four, an Army veteran and had been among the first complement of occupation troops in Japan; I was married, and -- as the saying might have had it -- had "been around." But I was not well equipped otherwise for the reality of the pedagogical encounter and I survived reasonably well, I think, as consequence of being perceived as a full fledged adult rather than by any professional expertise I might have had. And I must be candid in admitting that my preparation for teaching was minimal. Certainly, we have made quantum leaps since then. My student teaching, for example, was conducted like any other lecture course: one registered for it for a certain

period -- usually it was at least two hours in length -- and trekked over to the "training school" as scheduled, sat and observed, and departed when the time elapsed. I taught a "unit" only twice during the entire semester and none of that experience was in the subject that I was subsequently hired to teach. Nor did I receive much explicit feedback about my performance nor help with the preparation of lesson-planning. In retrospect, I think teaching was all very much conceived as an art form rather than a technology.

I am convinced that had I not been 24 and all the rest of it, I would have probably caved-in. That I was also an athletic coach added somewhat to my stature. Of course there was much greater respect for teaching in those times and we enjoyed much greater latitude in dealing with young people -- the notion that if you got punished at school, you could expect to get it again at home was still much the norm and, in some ways, that made more difference than anything else.

But thereby, it is not easy at all for me to resolve the issue of whether it is or is not more propitious for new teachers to be 21 or 25. There are certainly aspects of our culture today that suggest some wisdom in the idea that beginning teachers may indeed lack credibility if they begin too young. As I grow older and more cynical and as I observe the behavior of adolescents -- (and since I live across the street from the local high school, I do get that opportunity) -- I am increasingly convinced that young people are on the verge of being out of control anyway! If parents could see the way their children behave at the "Dari-Mart" during their lunch hour, they would be appalled! I think they don't want to see it because so long as they don't know, they have no problems. It is information that they don't want -- as with me when I come home and my wife tells me the grass needs mowing: it is information I don't want.

To large extent, this is a more real and genuine crisis in contemporary education than teaching itself, and it is not mentioned in most of the comments calling for educational reform. Our society has somehow transferred too many of the responibilities of youth serving functions from the family to the school but has not provided the authority to fulfil that function. Thus schools are only incidentally, places where traditional teaching and learning occur and more dramatically, places that must act as drug detoxification centers, adjuncts of the juvenile court system, health clinics and therapy centers for psychological intervention; as feeding, transporation and entertainment vehicles for a post-industrial family structure that is incoherent and non-cohesive.

The frequently mentioned need for teachers to have more autonomy over their work does not address this problem; it is not a problem of autonomy but of authority. A five-year program, a fifth year program, a career ladder, or an investment of ten times what we currently spend may not make teaching all that much better under those circumstances. You know that and I know that. What do you insert into the curruculum that insures a teacher the right to go to the bathroom in safety?

IF it remains that a major purpose is for schools to act as the major civilizing institution in modern culture, that function cannot be fulfilled without delegated and protected authority to teachers and administrators to instill responsible control and order within their organization.

Accordingly, there are two totally different sets of arguments which underscore the question of "when to begin." One set has to do with the logical value of learning about one's chosen career as soon as possible; the other set of arguments has to do with the reality of the context within which schools must

function -- a context, more than any other, wherein this nation is more centrally playiing out the continuing tensions in its historic philosophical dilemma between freedom and constraint, between individualism and the idea of community.

These are some of the unexamined presumptions that impinge on the work of the schools and their teachers yet we continue to be expected to provide not only graduates who can read and write and compute but, as well, who are appropriately indoctrinated with a system of protestant-ethic values that almost no one already out of school believes are worthy of practiced morality.

I know that view is a pessimistic one. But I know as well that in the face of that kind of cultural reality, we must continue to try to provide optimum preparation for those who must man the scholastic barricades. We are characteristically damned if we do and damned if we don't!

There are many other unexamined assumptions that complicate reform and that are not considered in either the Holmes nor the Carnegie reports. Some of these are more micronistic and operational but they must be attended to in any revised structure. Consider: that most programs have people drifting in and out of them in every term -- what do you do about transfer students? Are fifth year programs really going to enroll people "full time" -- are we ignoring all of the impressive demographic data about the adult student? That our cohorts are older, dropping-in and dropping-out? Can anyone initiate a program that has enough "plugs" in it to insure that people are going to come in as a class and go though as a class? How do you deal with that when you are under constant pressure to provide minimal staff development training for emergency certificates? And when even the best program human intellect could conceive will inevitably be short-circuited by the political and bureacratic process? These are real problems but the unexamined presumption holds that we can just start from scratch and everything will fall neatly into place. The barest reflection will inform us to the contrary.

Finally, there is the anxious concern about whether students will matriculate in a more extensive program for no more money than the traffic currently bears. I think that this is one of those "straw man" issues in final analysis. That is, an excuse rather than a reason NOT to change. I am not saying that it isn't a real issue only that it has to be a non-relevant one; it is simply beyond control. It is better to presume that if persons are better prepared, the market will adjust.

I realize that the tone of these remarks is somewhat dispirited but in truth, I remain optimistic -- perhaps naively optimistic but optimistic all the same. There is an emerging mandate for those of us in teacher education. It is not yet a clear mandate, nor ever will it probably be an unambiguous one but it is a chance for us. In final analysis, if we can fulfill this mandate even to a small extent, we will be doing remarkably well. And I really do not believe there is any responsible academician who will argue that what we are doing now is good enough.

I don't think we can do the job required of us under the present traditional four-year pattern. By the same token, it may be fantasy to believe that the political community will provide us much more than very modest increases in the resources we will require but we must find the best ways possible to do these tasks better in any case.

Concluding Notions

There are imperitives and alternatives that confront us and I am absolutely convinced that we may never have another opportunity quite so pregnant with

potential for measurably important gains as is now before us. The first imperitive is that we must change -- all of us. The changes that become normative and fashionable may not necessarily be those that we would prefer but the second imperitive is that we must find ways to adapt our programs to them. This will require a quality and style of leadership that will be anxiously challenging. In that, there will be times when everyone in this room will be caught in that uncomfortable twilight zone where one must decide whether to come down on the side of what is best for the profession as opposed to what is expedient for a program. But the alternatives are not without promise. I think there are at least these:

First, serious and thoughtful exploration of the ways to achieve five year and/or fifth year patterns, or short of that ideal, to restructure four year programs such that we can more coherently provide for the substantive and professional content that the extended models are predicated on. This means that no one should dismiss out-of-hand, the possibility that any program cannot adapt. Consideration then must be given to the hard work of deliberating the various scenarios involved in anticipating how best to do that. We should all get deeply involved in those kinds of discussions and be hard-headed and realistic about how to do it.

Secondly, we should be very cautious about presuming that this or that program in automatically insufficient. How are we to truly know that? But with that, each of us needs to begin to exert special effort and resources to find out how our people are doing, where, what they think about what we did to, or for, them and what they can do to help us do it better for those that come after them. To confront serious inquiry efforts that make it possible for us to compare each others' programs is fraught with anxiety but it is information we simply must have.

Thirdly, that we must remain active and visible in AACTE and carefully monitor and influence its positions and behaviors in this evolving circumstance. Professional leadership is distinctly different from organizational leadership but the two can be mutually supportive and symbiotic. It would be the worst mistake in my view for any of us to play the role of spoil sports -- to take our ball and glove and depart the field of play.

Fourthly, we must find ways to revitalize our "head sheds" about the importance and the survival of teacher education, not in a manner which trots out all of our defensive commitments but in a pro-active way. (God! I hate that word!)

In that regard, I want to come back to the point I made earlier -- about the attitude of college presidents. If I were the president of any state college -- maybe not of a private one, but of a state college in West Virginia, I would call a faculty convocation and I would say to the assembled brethren:

> "Listen to me. <u>I have a dream.</u> I have a dream that this institution shall return to its roots in teacher education. We are not going to reinvent the wheel but we are going to try to rediscover it. In the process of this revival, my dream is that we are going to be stronger and truer to our potential than ever before. That we are going to be the best in that field from the kindergarten through the highest reaches of our ability. If that means that we are going to offer post baccaluareate professional degrees, we are going to find some way to do it. We will not necessarily accept this challenge by eliminating much of the other good things that we do but we will make this focus the central mission of our efforts. If you believe, or think you can

> come to believe that this is worthy of us, I exhort you to give us your enthusiasm and your talent; if you do not believe it, you should get your credentials in order. We are going to be the best and we will not worry too much about what others do -- the final measure of our success will be the unique imprimatur we stamp on our graduates who will be sought after and praised wherever they light."

That's what I would say, and I would set a group of the brightest and most energetic in the faculty to the task of designing such a program and I would take it as my singular responsibillity to see that it got enacted even if I had to buy TV time to sell it.

You think anyone will do that? Not likely. But we could do the same thing through this organization and set a group to work to design such a program for all of us -- if it came down to the final fact that none of our institutions could pull it off, we might just go somewhere in the state and establish our own institution. As a matter of fact, I wrote a little paper about that last year that I called, "A Proposal for the WEST Virginia Teachers University." In it I proposed a single state institution providing programs through the teaching doctorate, with its own football team and marching band. I sent it to several people in leadership postiions in the state. Never heard from a single one of them.

Certainly such a notion as that seems revolutionary; maybe, more likely, only muddle-headedly fanciful. But there are some aspects of such a notion that might be worth exploring. For example, we might seriously consider a functional consortium of all programs whereby each of us are members of a kind of post-baccalureate faculty; where we develop a common and unified "clinical academy" composed of the best public school teachers anywhere in the state and who would have adjunct clinical professorial status with us, thus functioning as more involved partners in our enterprise. Such a system would require us to work together to effect a monolithic inter-institutional program. If appropriate degrees for such work might likely become entangled in institutional prerogatives, we might propose that, as such would be professional degrees, they should be awarded by the "Regents." In some such fashion, we might have our cake and continue to eat it, and thereby, get our Teachers University not as a school-within-a-school but as a school-among-schools. There is a well-developed model that might guide such efforts; it was "Bunny" Smith's long essay - A Design for a School of Pedagogy.(12)

A fifth alternative is to do nothing at all. This embraces the attitude that this too will pass; that there's no such thing as a single, effective model of teacher education so what difference does it make whether you do it one way or the other. People who think that way can say: "Hey, I've been around for a long time and I've seen all these notions come and go. In a hundred years what the hell difference will any of it make?"

Yes, well -- in a hundred years WHAT DIFFERENCE will it make! Who knows?

But if something doesn't change as a consequence of all of this -- if there isn't some fruitful progress even if not necessarily what some thoughtful people think is well short of ideal, then I think that we are in even more serious difficulty than the most sceptical soul could conceive. Teacher education must be better; it must be more esteemed; it must have proponents who believe in its redeeming virtues; and in that process, it must find a way for those of us who labor in its behalf to recapture the respect for it at collegiate levels that it once enjoyed. Surely, otherwise, collegiate teacher education will give way to an apprenticeship model already being touted by influential persons in and out of our

establishment who are convinced that what we do makes no difference at all.

It is my considered opinion that, through this organization, we could set a group to the task of developing a unified proposal for the restructuring of teacher education in West Virginia, discuss and debate it, and work our tails off to get it institutionalized. There may indeed be some casualties in the process but that risk is small compared to the promise of such an initiative.

Why not?

I think that what bifurcation truly implies is a distinction between programs that will change and those that will try to remain the same. In that regard, I am completely convinced that those programs that will not change will not be here when ten more years have passed.

Notes

1. Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century. Carnegie Foundation, 1986. (See, also: "Excerpts...," Chronicle of Higher Education. May 21, 1986, pp. 43-54.
The Holmes Group. "Tomorrow's Teachers: A Report of the Holmes Group." Chronicle of Higher Education. April 9, 1986. pp. 27-37.

2. See: Dale P. Scannell, "The Extended Teacher Education Program at the University of Kansas," Phi Delta Kappan. 44:6., October, 1984. pp. 130-134. And:
David C. Smith, R.G. Carroll, and B. Fry, "PROTEACH: Professional Teacher Preparation at the University of Florida," Ibid., pp. 134-136.

3. Robert L. Saunders. "The Center of Excellence in Teacher Education," Memphis State University. Memphis, 1985.

4. See, e.g., Dean Corrigan, "Forum on Teacher Education: Reflections on Current Issues," Appalachia Education Laboratory, 1985. and: AACTE. "Educating a Profession: Extended Programs for Teacher Education," Washington,D.C.: The Association, September, 1983.

5. R.B. Howsam, D.C. Corrigan, and G.W. Dennemark. Educating a Profession: Reprint with Postscript. Washington: AACTE, 1985. pp. 98-100.

6. David Smith, (ed.) Essential Knowledge for Beginning Teachers. Washington: AACTE, 1983. And, AACTE, "Educating a Profession: The Knowledge Base," report of the Task Force, 1983.

7. See, Bruce Peseau and Paul Orr, "The Outragious Underfunding of Teacher Education," Phi Delta Kappan. October, 1980.

8. W.G. Monahan, "Teacher Education in the 90s: A Working Paper," Appalachia Education Laboratory Occasional Paper, Charleston, W..Va.: AEL, Inc., November, 1984. (The "T.D." was first proposed to faculty in 1978.)

9. A. Etzioni (ed.) The Semi-Profesions and Their Organization. New York: Free Press, 1969.

10. Steven Muller, "Higher Education or Higher Skilling," Daedalus.

Vol. 1, Fall, 1974. pp. 148-159.

11. C.F. Donovan, S.J., "Tradition and Innovation in Teacher Education," 1967 Hunt Lecture. In: AACTE. A Decade of Thought on Teacher Education - 1960-1969. Washington: AACTE, 1969.

12. B.O. Smith. A Design for a School of Pedagogy. Washington: US Department of Education, 1980.